REMARKS

Claims 1 and 9 and 11 are concatenated to claim 1 and amended, after concatenation claim 9 and 11 are cancelled. Claim 2-8 are cancelled. Claim 10 is amended as 'according to claim 1' instead of 'according to claim 9'. Claim 15 and claim 16 are added. Claim 15 is copied from claim 12 and claim16 is copied from claim 13. Claim 12 is amended as 'according to Claim 1' instead of 'according to claim 2 or claim 9'. Claim 13 is amended as 'according to Claim 1' instead of 'according to claim 2 or claim 9'. Claim 15 is amended as 'according to Claim 10' instead of 'according to claim 2 or claim 9'. Claim 16 is amended as 'according to Claim 10' instead of 'according to claim 2 or claim 9'. Claim 14 is cancelled. On this same way above, the original application JP P2003-12545 was granted as JP Patent 4158534 on 7th July 2008 by JPO..

Response to abstract objections

Abstract is objected that the applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure. So I rewrote the abstract to describe more explicitly what the invention purposes particularly to avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "Disclosure is ...".

Response to claim objections

Claims 1 and 2 are objected to because the word 'computer' has not explained enough. So the word 'computer' attributed such as 'client computers wherein computers are comprising: at least one or more CPU, and main memories, and one or more network Information cards.' in the claim 1. This correction restricts the word 'computer' to 'the client computer and which is comprising at least one or more CPU, and main memories, and one or more network Information cards'. So this correction does not make the claim 1 extend at all. The claim 2 is cancelled.

On the same meanings above, the word 'information' in the topology servers attributed such as 'data dictionary, or locking status, or referential integrity status, or physical location of rows divided horizontally to the tables including sited in the databases in the other domains, or physical location of columns divided vertically to the tables including sited in the databases in the other domains, or multi transactions commit counter, or meta data of said database management systems, or meta data of file systems on which said database management systems exist' in the claim 1. This correction restricts the word ' information' to 'data dictionary, or locking status, or referential integrity status, or physical location of rows divided horizontally to the tables including sited in the databases in the other domains, or physical location of

columns divided vertically to the tables including sited in the databases in the other domains, or multi transactions commit counter or, meta data of said database management systems, or meta data of file systems on which said database management systems exist'. So this correction does not make the claim 1 extend at all.

Response to Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

The examiner rejected Claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C 102(b).

The main issue of this application is in the claim 11, which describes that the distributed database system according to Claim9 or Claim 10, having a plurality of said topology administration servers, wherein said topology administration server comprises: an exchanging unit for topology information, which exchanges topology information with the other topology administration server administrating the other administration domain communicable via network. The examiner teaches that necessary for coordinating the two masters as Draper teaches. In this application, these two masters are corresponding to the plurality of administration domains described in the claim 1. The claim 11 is according to the claim 1 via claim 9, so claims 1 and 9 and 11 are concatenated to claim 1 as an independent claim. The claim 1 as independent claim was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Draper et al, but the concatenation of the claim 11 and the claim 1 should be clear 35 U.S.C 102(b). The claim 9 is contained in the concatenation of the claim 11 and the claim 1 because the claim 11 was according to the claim 1 via the claim 9 indirectly.

The Claim 10 is amended such as 'according to claim 1' instead of 'according to claim 9'
The Claim 12 is split to the claim 12 and the new claim 15 to avoid multiple depend claims, and The Claim 13 is split to the claim 13 and the new claim 16 to avoid multiple depend claims.
The Claim 12 is amended such as 'according to claim 1' instead of 'according to claim 2 or claim 9'
The Claim 13 is amended such as 'according to claim 1' instead of 'according to claim 2 or claim 9'
The Claim 15 is amended such as 'according to claim 10' instead of 'according to claim 2 or claim 9'
The Claim 16 is amended such as 'according to claim 10' instead of 'according to claim 2 or claim 9'
The claim 2-9, 11, 14 are cancelled.

CONCLUSION

In sum, all pending claims are allowable.

The examiner is invited to contact the applicant at the telephone or e-mail provided below if in need of further information.

Reconsideration and favorable action are solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Mr.Shuhei Nishiyama

Dated: 20th August, 2009

Customer No.88,597
Pro Se Inventor
3-10-8-203 AINOKAWA
ICHIKAWA, CHIBA
272-0143 JP
Tel:+81-90-18141402
e-mail:shunishi@s3.dion.ne.jp